| Application No. | Applicant(s) |  |
|-----------------|--------------|--|
| 09/385,394      | YATES ET AL. |  |
| Examiner        | Art Unit     |  |
| RICHARD ELLIS   | 2183         |  |

| Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary  |                             |          |  |  |
|---|-----------------------------|----------|--|--|
|   | Examiner                    | Art Unit |  |  |
|   | RICHARD ELLIS               | 2183     |  |  |
| All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):  |                             |          |  |  |
| (1) <u>RICHARD ELLIS</u> .  | (3) <u>xxxxx</u> .          |          |  |  |
| (2) <u>Steven J. Gelman, #41,034</u> .  | (4) <u>xxxxx</u> .          |          |  |  |
| Date of Interview: 26 August 2011.  |                             |          |  |  |
| Type:  ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal [copy given to: ☐ applicant [   | applicant's representative] |          |  |  |
| Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: Yes If Yes, brief description:  | ⊠ No.                       |          |  |  |
| Issues Discussed 1101 1112 1102 1103 Oth<br>(For each of the checked box(es) above, please describe below the issue and detail  |                             |          |  |  |
| Claim(s) discussed: 19 and 21.  |                             |          |  |  |
| Identification of prior art discussed: none.  |                             |          |  |  |
| Substance of Interview (For each issue discussed, provide a detailed description and indicate if agreement was reached. Some topics may include: identification or clarification of a reference or a portion thereof, claim interpretation, proposed amendments, arguments of any applied reference es e.e)   |                             |          |  |  |
| Claims 19 and 21 had been amended in the amendment of 3/24/2011 to depend from claim 10, however the same amendment had canceled claim 10. Applicant indicated that claims 19 and 21 should have been made dependent from claim 4 and authorized the included examiner's amendment making that change.  |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
|   |                             |          |  |  |
| Applicant recordation instructions: It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of interview.   |                             |          |  |  |
| Examiner recordation instructions: Examiners must summarize the substance of any interview of record. A complete and proper recordation of the substance of an interview should include the items listed in MPEP 130.4 for complete and proper recordation including the identification of the general thrust of each argument or issue discussed, a general indication of any other pertinent matters discussed regarding patentability and the general results or outcome of the interview, to include an indication as to whether or not agreement was reached on the issues raised. |                             |          |  |  |
| Attachment  |                             |          |  |  |
| /Richard Ellis/   |                             |          |  |  |
| Primary Examiner, Art Unit 2183   |                             |          |  |  |